DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 406 757 EA 028 327

AUTHOR	Power, Sally; Whitty, Geoff
TITLE	Teaching New Subjects? The Hidden Curriculum of Marketized Education Systems.
PUB DATE	Mar 97
NOTE	26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997).
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Corporate Support; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Free Enterprise System; *Government School Relationship; *Hidden Curriculum; *National Curriculum; Politics of Education; Private Sector; Social Control
IDENTIFIERS	Australia; New Zealand; United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

Many countries have introduced a range of policies that attempt to reformulate the relationships among government, schools, and parents through the application of market forces. This paper looks at the hidden curriculum of marketization and explores the extent to which the recent trend toward quasi-markets in public education systems are permeating the classroom and affecting the nature of educational transmissions. The paper looks at research from England, Australia, New Zealand, and the United States and explores the tension between the overt and "hidden" curriculum of the reforms and its significance for fostering different forms of social solidarity. The paper also connects with discussions on the globalization of education policy and/or broader changes in the nature of modern/postmodern societies, and the role of national education systems in encouraging and/or inhibiting such developments. (Contains 54 references.) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 406 757

Teaching New Subjects?

The Hidden Curriculum of Marketized Education Systems

Sally Power
School of Education
University of Bristol, UK

and

Geoff Whitty,
Institute of Education
University of London, UK

Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual General Meeting, Chicago, March, 1997

EA 028 327

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Power

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Teaching New Subjects? The Hidden Curriculum of Marketised Education Systems

Sally Power, School of Education, University of Bristol, UK
and
Geoff Whitty, Institute of Education, University of London, UK

Paper to be presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual General Meeting, Chicago, March, 1996

Abstract
The aim of this paper is to explore the extent to which the recent trend towards quasi-markets in public education systems is permeating the classroom and affecting the nature of educational transmissions. Through looking at research evidence from four national contexts, the paper will explore the tension between the overt and 'hidden' curriculum of the reforms and its significance for fostering different forms of social solidarity. In addressing these issues, the paper will also connect with discussions on the globalisation of education policy and/or broader changes in the nature of modern/postmodern societies, and the role of national education systems in encouraging/inhibiting such developments.

Introduction
Speaking at the Institute of Economic Affairs, London, in 1988, Bob Dunn, then Under-Secretary of State at the Department of Education and Science (DES), speculated whether 'a study in the life and teachings of Adam Smith should be compulsory in all schools'.[1]

There is little doubt that the ideas of free market advocates have been highly influential in restructuring public education in the UK and other countries. We have not yet seen the life and teachings of Adam Smith written into the school timetable, but we should not assume that the lessons of neoliberalism are not being learnt. This paper looks at the hidden curriculum of marketisation and explores the extent to which schools are teaching new subjects - or even 'new right' subjects.

The marketisation of education - a global phenomenon?
Public education systems are in the process of rapid and far-reaching change. In many countries, a range of policies has been introduced that attempt to reformulate the relationship between government, schools and parents through the application of market forces. Our own research concentrates on recent education reform in England, Australia, New Zealand and the USA, but countries with quite different histories, such as Chile, Sweden and South Africa, are seeing the introduction of similar policies. Although, as Andy Green illustrates,[2] not all countries are extolling the virtues of the education market place, the almost simultaneous emergence of comparable reforms across different continents has led some to suggest that the marketisation of education needs to be

understood as a global phenomenon. Indeed, it has been argued that this trend is related to a broader economic, political and cultural process of globalisation.

The precise features and significance of 'globalisation' are contested, but are generally considered to be connected with a shift in the nature of economic production and cultural consumption. For some writers, this shift marks a fundamental break with the past and the arrival of qualitatively different conditions that have been variously described as, amongst other things, postmodernity[3] and post-traditionalism[4]. For others, it marks a phase within capitalism, from Fordism to post-Fordism[5] or neo-Fordism[6], from organised to late[7] or disorganised[8] capitalism.

Whatever the ultimate significance of these transformations, there is general agreement that the role of the nation state is in a process of change. It is frequently claimed that it is becoming less important on economic[9], political[10] and cultural[11] grounds. As capital becomes more mobile, nations lose control over economic activity. New international regulative bodies limit national sovereignty. Technological innovations render geographic boundaries less significant, and the penetration of commercialisation into all spheres of public life is deemed to reduce cultural differences between nations. Within advanced capitalist countries, the demise of industry has led to a fragmentation of past collectivities and communities. As the old power blocs break down, archetypical modernist projects of social engineering are abandoned and national systems of welfare provision dismantled. With reference to schooling, education ceases to be a publicly prescribed and distributed entitlement and becomes a commodity available for private consumption. Usher and Edwards contend that, in this situation:

> '... the state plays less and less of a role as the information available for circulation in the social formation comes from a wide range of sources. The control of learning through state-sponsored institutions is replaced by networks of information, in which to be 'educated' is to have consumed the information necessary for the optimising of performance.'[12]

Dismantling public systems of education

Dale reminds us that a whole set of political-economic variables will affect the ways in which different education systems respond to processes of globalisation.[13] Nevertheless, the dismantling of public systems of education is evident, to different degrees, in all of the countries we have researched.

In England, prior to the 1980s, the vast majority of children were educated in public schools maintained by democratically elected local education authorities (LEAs) which exercised political and bureaucratic control over their schools. After the Conservative victory at the 1979 election, the Thatcher and Major governments set about trying to break the local government monopoly of public schooling through the provisions of a series of Education Acts passed in the 1980s and early 1990s. The Local Management of Schools (LMS) policy has given all public schools control over their own budgets (including that for teachers' salaries) which they receive according to a formula determined directly by the number and ages of pupils. Only a very small proportion of their funds (at most 15

percent) are retained centrally by the LEA. Schools have also been given the opportunity to 'opt out' of their LEAs entirely. After conducting a parental ballot schools can run themselves as grant maintained (GM) schools with direct funding from central government. Open Enrolment allows popular public schools to attract as many students as possible, at least up to their physical capacity, instead of being kept to lower limits or strict catchment areas in order that other schools could remain open. This was seen as the necessary corollary of per capita funding in creating a quasi-market in education.

By contrast with England, New Zealand in the 1980s was a somewhat surprising context for a radical experiment in school reform, let alone one associated with the conservative agenda. The initial reforms were introduced by a Labour government in October 1989 and based on the Picot Report *'Tomorrow's Schools'*. They led to a shift in the responsibility for budget allocation, staff employment and educational outcomes from central government and regional educational boards to individual schools. Schools were given boards of trustees originally composed of parents (but extended in 1991 to encourage the inclusion of business people) who had to negotiate goals with the local community and agree a charter with central government. Because these boards were given effective control over their enrolment schemes, the New Zealand reforms have ushered in a much more thorough-going experiment in free parental choice in the public sector than was introduced in England.

The federal nature of Australia's constitution makes it difficult to talk of a national system of education with any precision. Nevertheless, as Max Angus comments, the drive towards decentralisation has 'spread like an epidemic across systems and state boundaries'.[14] The importance of parents as 'consumers' is less evident in Australian policy discourse than in our other three countries, with the reforms stressing the benefits of economic rationalism in a drive towards enhancing standards and efficiency. Common features of Australian state-led reforms include the requirement that schools produce corporate plans and the allocation of budgets to individual institutions which are controlled by local decision-making groups, typically including community representatives. Some states have gone further than others down the road to decentralisation. Victoria and New South Wales have introduced a version of 'opting out' which grants schools even more autonomy and is likely to break up the single state-wide system of public schooling.

As with Australia, it is impossible to talk of a national system of schooling in America - although Chubb and Moe claim that US education has been dominated by the 'one best system' approach allegedly responsible for uniformity and mediocrity in the public school system as a whole[15]. The past decade has seen federal pronouncements on education policy, such as America 2000, which advocate the marketisation of public schools, but most policies are made at state and district level. Although the range of programmes is wide, parental choice and greater school autonomy are among the most popular restructuring reforms.[16] Marketisation schemes include controlled choice in Cambridge, Massachusetts and Montclair, New Jersey, the East Harlem 'choice' experiment in New York, and the Milwaukee private school 'voucher' experiment. The USA has also seen some of the clearest examples of the commercialisation of education. Since the late 1980s several companies, from Federal Express to Burger King, have made plans to set up schools. Among the most ambitious plans were those of Whittle Inc whose Edison Project was designed to create a nationwide system of

profit-making private schools.[17]

The implications of these changes for the provision of education are likely to be profound. Much research has focused on the impact which the dismantling of public education will have on efficiency, effectiveness and equity, but it is also likely to influence the nature of educational transmissions. The link between corporate involvement in schools, the structure and governance of schools and the form and content of the messages they transmit to their students will not be straightforward, but its significance should not be underestimated. Indeed, the end of national education systems could be considered to augur the end of a key element of economic and cultural reproduction. As Andy Green argues:

> Through national education systems states fashioned disciplined workers and loyal recruits; created and celebrated national languages and literatures; popularized national histories and myths of origin, disseminated national laws, customs and social mores, and generally explained the ways of the state to the people and the duties of the people to the state... National education was a massive engine of integration, assimilated the local to the national and the particular to the general. In short it created, or tried to create, the civic identity and national consciousness which would bind each to the state and reconcile each to the other...'[18]

Green argues that the marketisation of education and concomitant reduction in state intervention will lead to a lack of social cohesion which may weaken economic development. Others, however, suggest that education systems are teaching new forms of identity that are more appropriate to these new times. Nation states, they submit, no longer need disciplined workers and loyal recruits. Globalisation obviates the need for ideologies which unambiguously assimilate the local to the national and the particular to the general. The old order is swept away with the advent of the transnational economy. From this viewpoint, Marquand's comments on the economic vision upheld by the British government might apply to any of our countries:

> The global market-place which the new-style Tories celebrate is cold and hard; in a profound sense it is also subversive. It uproots communities, disrupts families, mocks faiths and erodes the ties of place and history. It has created a demotic global culture, contemptuous of tradition, hostile to established hierarchies and relativist in morality. Above all, it has made a nonsense of national sovereignty, at any rate in the economic sphere.'[19]

The corporate curriculum?

One indicator of the alleged ascendancy of the global market-place over tradition and culture might be the increasing presence of corporate interests in the classroom. It has been argued that the liberal humanism of the curriculum is gradually but inexorably being superseded by the neoliberal consumerism promulgated by business and industry. Whereas the school curriculum has traditionally transcended - indeed actively distanced itself from - the world of commerce,[20] the marketisation of education is forging a new intimacy between these two domains.

Commercial penetration of the curriculum is evident in all our four countries. In America, for instance, commercial satellite network 'Channel One' offers schools free monitors on condition that 90 percent of students watch its news and adverts almost every day. Molnar cites a wide range of examples where corporate business entices schools to promote their products.[21] In everyone of our countries there are schemes whereby equipment can be purchased with vouchers from supermarket chains, the take-up of which is enhanced as a result of budget constraints and the removal of public control.[22] Harris' research on the Australian Coles programme reveals not only the vast amount of time teachers can spend tallying dockets (589 hours in one school over six months), but also the promotional space occupied by visible tallies and scoreboards as well as the advertising on the computer equipment eventually acquired[23]. In Britain, there has been a such proliferation of commercially sponsored curriculum materials that an independent organization designed to protect consumer interests has seen fit to publish a good practice guide for teachers, governors, school boards and parents.[24]

Sometimes the objective of this commercial penetration seems to be product familiarisation, but curriculum materials can also be used to portray a partial, and inaccurate, account of business interests and impact. Molnar quotes a study guide on banking which defines 'free enterprise' as the symbol of 'a nation which is healthy and treats its citizens fairly'.[25] Harty's international survey of corporate products in the classroom found that 'the biggest polluters of the environment - the chemical, steel, and paper industries - were the biggest producers of environmental education material'.[26]

Critics fear that the commercialisation of education will not only lead children to adopt an uncritical approach to corporate activities, it will also damage the cultural work of the school. In common with many critiques of what is sometimes called 'McDonaldisation', commercialisation is seen to impoverish cultural heritage. Harty believes that schools will develop 'an anti-intellectual emphasis' and 'a consumptionist drive to purchase status goods'. Indeed, she alleges that the permeation of multinationals 'contributes to a standardised global culture of material gratification... [which will] impinge on the cultural integrity of whole nations'.[27] In this scenario, far from encouraging students to appreciate the particularities of their regional or national inheritance, schooling is about the training of desires, rendering subjects open to the seduction of ever changing consumption patterns and the politics of lifestyling.

While the presence of corporate interests in the classroom needs to be treated as a cause for some concern, we should be careful not to overstate the extent to which they have squeezed out more conventional school activities. Corporate interests *are* penetrating the educational domain to an greater extent than hitherto - but there is no evidence of a business takeover. Many of the corporate-financed schools in the USA have now been incorporated into the public sector. The Edison Project, mentioned above, reduced its plans for a nationwide chain of schools to four after it managed to raise only $12 million of the $2.5 billion originally envisaged.[28] In Britain, the City Technology College initiative - held up as auguring a new partnership between business and education - was supposed to be funded primarily by private companies. In the event, the government found it extremely difficult to secure sponsorship, which at best amounted to 20 percent of capital expenditure

with public funds making up the shortfall.[29]

We should also be cautious about presuming that the messages of the multinationals are 'successfully' received. It is possible to imagine classes in which teachers make the relationship between business and education problematic. The ethics of encouraging children to shop at particular supermarkets has no doubt already been widely debated by students and teachers. It is hard to envisage health educators *not* pointing out the ironies of fast food manufacturers promoting good health guides. Similarly, curriculum materials designed by multinationals can be used to highlight omissions and distortions and expose the vested interests of their producers. This does not mean we should be complacent about the commercialisation of the curriculum. As Harty points out, many teachers do not discuss the commercial origins and implications of the materials, an aspect which is likely to increase as teachers cope with all the other pressures of devolution and marketisation. Nevertheless, the process of inculcating these new values and desires is unlikely to be straightforward. There is evidence of increased involvement of business and industry within marketised education systems than in the earlier system based on public control, but the messages promoted by commercial sponsorship tend to be highly visible. This visibility makes them more accessible to interrogation and, therefore, potentially less insidious than other aspects of marketisation.

The state-controlled curriculum

Claims that the content of the curriculum is being increasingly infiltrated by corporate control also downplay that extent to which recent policies have sought to increasingly regulate what counts as appropriate school knowledge and how it is to be assessed. Despite 'come-ons' to business and industry from all of our countries' governments, there is little to suggest that they are prepared to relinquish control of the curriculum. Usher and Edwards' confident claim, quoted earlier, that in these new times 'the state plays less and less of a role'[30] is not borne out by evidence. In Britain successive central governments have clearly consolidated their position through the centralising measures of the National Curriculum and its associated assessment procedures. McKenzie argues that they have 'actually increased their claims to knowledge and authority over the education system whilst promoting a theoretical and superficial movement towards consumer sovereignty'.[31] Although other countries have not been as prescriptive as Britain, many governments at state or national level have tightened their control over the curriculum in terms of what is taught and/or how this is to be assessed.

Central regulation of the curriculum is not only geared towards standardising performance criteria in order to facilitate professional accountability and consumer choice within the education market-place, it is also about creating, or recreating, forms of national identities. In the UK, the formulation of the National Curriculum has been underlain by a consistent requirement that schools concentrate on British history, British geography and 'classic' English literature. During its development, the influential Hillgate Group expressed concern about pressure for a multicultural curriculum and argued for 'the traditional values of western societies' underlying British culture which 'must not be sacrificed for the sake of a misguided relativism, or out of a misplaced concern for those who might not yet be aware of its strengths and weaknesses'.[32] This privileging of one narrow and

partial version of national culture is less visible in Australia and New Zealand - although the importance of 'knowledge of Australia's history' is a key element in ministerial pronouncements on the objectives of the nation's schools[33] and in both countries there have been attempts to generate a distinctive national identity[34]. The issue of a national curriculum has attracted considerable controversy within the United States, but individual states can legislate on curricula and for many years have controlled the selection of school textbooks. Texas, for instance, has a policy of excluding publications which do not promote 'traditional' lifestyles and values.[35] The general shift rightwards and the influence of powerful fundamentalist and conservative lobbyists is likely to ensure that any legislated curriculum, whether at state or national level, will draw on a partial and narrow selection of American culture.[36]

Far from reflecting a loosening of geographic boundaries, a diminution of the specificity of the nation state or the increasing interpenetration of cultures characteristic of globalisation, these curriculum reforms, pronouncements and proposals represent a conscious attempt to position subjects in ways which hark backwards to some imagined past, rather than forwards into new globalised times. As Stuart Hall comments '... at the very moment when the so-called material basis of the old English identity is disappearing over the horizon of the West and the East, Thatcherism brings Englishness into a more firm definition, a narrower but firmer definition than it ever had before'.[37] The global market-place may be, as Marquand claims, 'contemptuous of tradition, hostile to established hierarchies and relativist in morality'[38] - but the visions of little England or small town America conjured up by new right curricula certainly are not.

It is clear that any commercial messages emanating from the corporate production of curriculum materials need to be offset against those which are underscored by new right governments highlighting the inalienable rights to national sovereignty, the inviolability of 'our' cultural heritage and the absolutism of traditional (often 19th century) morality. However, while the overt content of the curriculum may reassert the values of liberal humanism and a reinvigorated traditionalism, these are embedded in an increasingly marketised system. It may be more subtle shifts in the *form* and *governance* of schooling as much as changes in the *content* of the curriculum which are interpellating school subjects within the market place.

Learning from marketised relations

The marketisation of education has changed relations between and within schools in a number of ways which can be seen to reflect and reorient students tacitly within new phases of consumption and production. Stephen Ball claims that 'insofar as students are influenced and affected by their institutional environment then the system of morality 'taught' by schools is increasingly well accommodated to the values complex of the enterprise culture'.[39] Old values of community, co-operation, individual need and equal worth, which Ball claims underlay public systems of comprehensive education, are being replaced by market place values that celebrate individualism, competition, performativity and differentiation. These values and dispositions are not made visible and explicit, but emanate from the changing social context and permeate the education system in myriad ways. At times, these values might be seen to complement each other, in other instances they appear contradictory. Just as there are tensions within the overt curriculum between the cultural

elitism of 'nationalist' curricula and various forms of commercial sponsorship, so too there are tensions both within and between elements of the hidden curriculum. Diversification sits uneasily alongside homogenisation and hierarchy. The new era of consumer empowerment becomes articulated with a reinvigorated traditionalism.

One facet of the changed institutional environment is the fragmentation of national and state systems of common schooling is the desire to encourage diversity on the supply side. In Britain, the government has made a number of provisions for specialist schools. CTCs were intended to be new secondary schools for the inner city, with a curriculum emphasis on science and technology. GM schools, which had 'opted out' of their LEAs were permitted to change their character by varying their enrolment schemes and encouraged to emphasise specialised curriculum provision, for instance, in music or languages. In the USA, applications for charter schools status have been made for schools such as the Global Renaissance Academy of Distinguished Education, EduPreneurship, the Global Academy for International Athletics[40] - in addition to the many magnet school initiatives. Diversity has been less dominant in the early rhetoric surrounding the Australian and New Zealand reforms - but in both countries market mechanisms have been put in place which seek to fracture existing systems of unified public provision.

The breakdown of these 'mass' systems of education and the drive towards diversity of provision has been seen by some to reflect changes in the wider context. In particular, it is argued that as the economy shifts from Fordism to post- or neo-Fordism, from organised to disorganised capitalism, the range and nature of subjectivities which schools must produce will undergo corresponding transformations. Education systems will no longer be required to produce a stratified labour force, but rather one which is differentiated and specialised. Here the context and mode of learning may be more significant than the content of the lessons. Jane Kenway argues that:

> '... educational institutions are not only to produce the post-Fordist, multi-skilled, innovative worker but to behave in post-Fordist ways themselves; moving away from mass production and mass markets to niche markets and 'flexible specialisation" ... a post-Fordist mind-set is currently having implications in schools for management styles, curriculum, pedagogy and assessment.'[41]

In the US, the planned Edison Project incorporated a high tech image of the school of the future 'where each student will have a computerised learning station, without textbooks or classrooms, and each teacher will have an office, just like real people -- with phones'.[42] In England, CTCs appear to be in the 'vanguard' of such a transformation with their 'shopping mall' or 'business park' architecture designed to emulate the world of finance.[43] Gewirtz et al provide a semiological analysis of the impact of market reforms and comment on the 'glossification' of school imagery.[44] Many of their case study schools had revamped reception areas to enhance the 'corporate' image of the school, installing fittings that would previously have been associated with banking and commerce. Principals were concerned to promote the 'corporate colours' of the school - even, as in one case, extending to the colour of the gas taps in the new science laboratories. Although it is difficult to evaluate the significance of messages transmitted through the organisation and presentation of the physical

environment, they are unlikely to be as superficial as phrases such as 'glossification' imply. Indeed the physical dimension of going to school may be lost altogether. Perhaps in correspondence with the rise of 'homeworking', Usher and Edwards speak of a 'reconfiguration' of the regulation of students who will no longer be required to attend educational institutions at all.[45]

While it is hard to envisage the disestablishment of schooling in the near future, it is often considered that technological innovations are beginning to transform the social relations of education. Kenway et al talk of a new pedagogy which can be characterised by 'infinite lateral connectedness' and 'vertical porousness'.[46] Old hierarchies and boundaries will be swept aside as schools develop less directional modes of learning. Corresponding to alleged changes in the workplace,[47] relationships between staff and between staff and students will move towards a 'flatter' structure. The boundary between home and school will also be eroded through the development cross-site learning based on computer technologies. The high status conventionally accorded to print-based culture will be reduced as more high tech modes of knowledge production and transmission come 'on line'. In contrast to traditional conceptions of education which emphasise initiation into sacred bodies of knowledge, the nexus between teacher and pupil is restructured so that, in the words of Usher and Edwards, educative processes need only 'constitute a relationship between producer and consumer where knowledge - quantities of information - is exchanged on the basis of the value it has to the consumer, and in which consumers commodify their 'experience' in exchange for qualifications'.[48]

There is little evidence to indicate that we are currently witnessing such sweeping transformations, certainly at the level of compulsory education. At the system level, diversity and specialisation within education provision remain objectives rather than reality. Attempts to diversify provision have been a good deal less innovative than promised and have tended to reinforce, rather than diminish, hierarchies between schools. Moreover, certainly within the UK, it is important to note that these 'new' kinds of school have been Government, rather than market-led, initiatives. There is no indication from any of our four countries that recent reforms have modified the distinctions which are commonly made between 'bad', 'good' and 'better' schools. And far from introducing horizontal forms of differentiation, all the evidence thus far suggests that marketisation of education leads to an increase in vertical differentiation - exaggerating linear hierarchies through traditional rather than alternative criteria.

Social relations *within* schools are no more unambiguously post-Fordist. Blackmore's observations of staff involvement in self-managing schools point to 'strong modernist tendencies for a top-down, executive mode of decision-making ... [alongside its] "weaker" post-modern claims to decentralize and encourage diversity, community ownership, local discretion, professional autonomy and flexible decision-making'[49]. Evidence of the arrival of a 'new' pedagogy is even harder to find. Although at one level schools are becoming more 'business-like' in approach and appearance, many are placing a renewed emphasis on pupil dress and authoritarian modes of discipline. In our research on GM schools, we found a reinvigorated traditionalism in which relationships between staff and students were more, rather than less, formal and hierarchical.[50] Some research also shows that it leads to greater tracking within schools. Gewirtz et al found increasing segregation of 'able' children and a move from mixed ability grouping towards setting in almost all their case study schools.[51] It is true

that new technologies are rapidly finding their way into schools, but there is little evidence that they are contributing to a shift from teaching to a culture which emphasises pupil-directed learning. Even in those centres of innovation - the CTCs - lessons tended to be conducted along conventional lines with few instances of new technologies being used outside IT lessons[52] - an aspect noted by Kenway et al in their own research[53]. Far from seeing new technologies as the start of a new and different epoch of learning, Michael Apple has argued that we should recognise them as part of an intensifying process of proletarianisation and deskilling.[54]

The connection between performance and accountability within marketised education systems has tended to lead to the fragmentation and delineation of curriculum content and the reduction in teacher and learner autonomy. In parallel with criticisms of other centralised curricula, Robertson and Soucek's research within a Western Australian secondary school found that the new curriculum '... was at the same time both highly tailored and modularized into consumable packages and excessively assessed'.[55] They claim '[t]hese features worked to compartmentalize school learning and teaching, as well as to develop an intense sense of alienation between the student and the teachers ... exaggerating the reductive, technocratic and fragmented nature of much school knowledge'.[56]

What is striking here is how reminiscent these words are of Bowles and Gintis. Writing twenty years ago, at about the time when economic production could be characterised as 'organized capitalism',[57] albeit in its final phases, they claimed structural correspondence between the social relations of the educational system and those of production in which:

> '... relationships between administrators and teachers, teachers and students, students and students, and students and their work - replicate the hierarchical division of labour. Hierarchical relations are reflected in the vertical authority lines from administrators to teachers to students. Alienated labour is reflected in the student's lack of control over his or her education, the alienation of the student from curriculum content, and the motivation of school work through a system of grades and other external rewards... Fragmentation in work is reflected in the institutionalized and often destructive competition among students through continual and ostensible meritocratic ranking and evaluation.'[58]

The commodified curriculum - a new correspondence?

The similarity between Bowles and Gintis' analysis and more recent accounts, such as that of Robertson and Soucek, begs a number of questions. First, it raises the issue of whether schools are engaged in the production of 'old' rather than 'new' subjectivities. More specifically, are marketised education systems simply a new way of producing 'old' subjects? Such a position would presumably be supported by those who argue that the marketisation of public education is a state-initiated response to the recurrent problem of legitimating the mode of production, and the state's role within it, at a time of crisis in capital accumulation.[59]

If so, this would suggest that the case for claiming 'new times' is less than convincing. Hirst and

Thompson certainly claim that there is nothing particularly new about the current degree or rate of international interaction which has always been, and still is, patchy and sporadic rather than the more universal and inexorable process implied by globalisation theorists.[60] Even if we concede that there has been, within our four countries, a reduction in the profile of the nation state as an international entity, there is nothing to suggest that it is weakening its grip on areas of internal regulation. Allen questions whether we should not see recent changes in modes of production as being neo- rather than post-Fordist inasmuch as we are seeing only an 'adjustment' to the principles of mass production rather than moving 'a step beyond'.[61] Nor is the evidence of a global culture overwhelming. Transnational acculturisation is hardly reciprocal and can be seen as little more than the hegemonic influence of the West. Abu Lughod analyses critical cultural moments, such as the crisis over Rushdie's Satanic Verses, to reveal how *un*globalised culture has become.[62]

The problem with arguments about the scope and pace of change is that they are to a large extent irresolvable - certainly at the point of transition. But, even if recent changes are less ground-breaking than some social theorists suggest, this does not mean that the picture is only one of continuity. Marketised education systems provide evidence of both changes and continuities which appear to both match and contradict other social trends. This lack of correspondence between education systems and the wider social and economic context may result from delayed response or complete structural disarticulation. Delayed response arguments are perhaps more convincing than those that go for complete disarticulation. At the level of further and higher education, in particular, it is possible to see a commodification of learning packages, a drive towards 'pick and mix' courses which have been described as a 'cafeteria curriculum' and a degree of de-institutionalisation with the growth of distance learning through new technologies. It could be argued that these changes are only evident at the margins rather than in the core of the education system, and that the central structure and function of the compulsory phases remain unchanged. On the other hand, any claims for the distinctiveness of the compulsory dimension of public education may be increasingly difficult to sustain. There has been some debate among neoliberals on the merits of disestablishing schools.[63] But even if schools retain their institutional location, it is perhaps only a matter of time before they experience the changes which are taking place in the later phases. Nor would acknowledging such correspondence necessarily mean making a wholesale commitment to the kind of correspondence principle expounded by Bowles and Gintis. As Bailey comments, 'it may be that correspondence does not have universal applicability, but nevertheless is an insightful idea to apply to certain places and at certain times'.[64] Indeed, Hickox and Moore argue that stronger claims can be made for correspondence under post-Fordism than the system of mass production analysed by Bowles and Gintis.[65] Similarly, Bernstein critiques earlier applications of the thesis but holds that within the market-oriented visible pedagogy, the specialisation of curricula 'allows for an almost perfect reproduction of the hierarchy of the economy within the school, or between the schools (as in the case of "magnet" schools), through the grading of curricula ...'.[66]

If this is so, then we may be at the beginning of a process of change which will have profound significance not just for the organisation of schools but for the nature of educational transmissions. But, whether these changes are anticipated with optimism or concern, we should be cautious in presuming that schools will successfully mould the future citizens and consumers required for the

'new times'. The publicly-controlled national education systems may have produced disciplined workers and local recruits, but they produced other sorts of dispositions that appear less than functional to the needs of capital. As Bernstein pointed out in 1977: 'Consider various forms of industrial action over the last hundred years. The school in this respect is highly inefficient in creating a docile, deferential and subservient work force. The school today has difficulty in disciplining its pupils'.[67]

On the one hand it might be argued that if education systems had problems fulfilling the relatively simple tasks of Fordist modes of production, how much more difficult to create the kind of flexible postmodern subjects apparently required within the global marketplace. On the other, it could be claimed that the erosion of the collectivities characteristic of systems of mass production will facilitate the interpellation of subjects within the new order. Viewed in this way, the indiscipline to which Bernstein refers becomes not merely evidence of inadequate socialisation into the labour force, but a manifestation of resistance. If the solidarity of the factory floor provided Willis' lads with the cultural resources for opposition,[68] will the demise of mass production remove the basis of similar counter-hegemonic strategies? Furthermore, it is not just working class solidarity which is threatened. Hall argues there has been 'been a fragmentation of the 'great collective social identities of class, of race, of nation, and of the West'.[69] It is not that they have disappeared, but rather that 'none of them is, any longer, in either the social, historical or epistemological place where they were in our conceptualizations of the world in the recent past'.[70] Identities, it is claimed, are no longer fixed, but fluid and adaptable. As Featherstone puts it:

> 'It is the capacity to shift the frame, and move between varying range of foci, the capacity to handle a range of symbolic material out of which various identities can be formed and reformed in different situations, which is relevant in the contemporary global situation.'[71]

However, consideration of such issues can blind us to the role of education in fostering collective identities and modes of engagement. As James Henig says, 'the sad irony of the current education-reform movement is that, through over-identification with school-choice proposals rooted in market-based ideas, the healthy impulse to consider radical reforms to address social problems may be channeled into initiatives that further erode the potential for collective deliberation and collective response'.[72]

Reasserting collectivities?

It could be argued that if opposition arises out of collective action and awareness, as has traditionally been held by theorists on the left, then the atomised and flexible consumers of marketised education will be unable to counteract the penetrating individualisation of global markets. On the other hand, we should be careful not to misrepresent the nature and impact of earlier modes of collective engagement. Past solidarities were often more imagined than real. As Featherstone demonstrates, accounts of working class life, both in sociology and popular culture, typically overplay its homogeneity and capacity for communal bonding.[73] They also frequently overlook the sexual and

racial basis of exclusion and inclusion within such 'solidarities'. Theoretically, conceptions of the decentered subject and radical pluralism also undermine the notion of 'fixed' identities and enduring allegiances.

To some extent this tension is evident, but also accommodated, within the contrasting messages of the overt and the hidden curriculum. While at the level of direct transmissions, students are to be taught the values of the cultural restorationists,[74] the context in which they are taught may undermine their canons. While the content of the lessons emphasises heritage and tradition, the form of their transmission is becoming increasingly commodified within the new education market place.

Similar issues about the relationship between the overt and hidden curriculum are apparent in discussions about alternatives to current education reforms. Concern that the 'subversive' tendencies of the global market place will erode national and communal values has led some to suggest that these aspects should receive more attention in the formal curriculum. In Britain, David Hargreaves, who is generally supportive of recent policies, nevertheless believes we should reassert a sense of common citizenship by insisting on core programmes of civic education in all schools.[75] Coming from a different direction, Andy Green's comparative research also leads him to suggest that schools will need to regenerate social cohesion 'as the social atomization induced by global market penetration becomes increasingly dysfunctional'.[76] He argues that the current abdication on the part of governments to pursue goals of social cohesion will need to be reversed: 'With the decline of socially integrating institutions and the consequent atrophy of collective social ties, education may soon again be called upon to stitch together the fraying social fabric.'[77] And, in situations where neo-Schumpeterian responses to globalisation supersede neo-liberal ones,[78] the role of the state is augmented and education takes an important role in positioning subjects both in relation to the nation state and the world economy.

However, with reference to Hargreaves' proposal for civic education in the present policy context, it is unclear how far adding a component to the timetable will provide an effective counterbalance to the permeating values of the market place. If much of the potency of the hidden curriculum derives from its invisibility, it would seem unlikely that its effects could be overcome by a dose of citizenship education. And while Green holds that '[t]he scope for education to act as a socially integrative force is not necessarily diminished or impeded by the forces of globalization and postmodernity',[79] he himself provides few indicators of how education systems can be restructured and who will initiate such a process in a situation where responsibility for education is increasingly seen as a matter for individuals and families. Countering the power of the hidden curriculum seems likely to require the development of new sets of relations both within schools and beyond them, so that students can experience responses to globalisation other than the currently dominant neo-liberal and neo-conservative ones. More specifically, if we want students to learn democratic citizenship we need to put in place structures which embody those principles, such as 'little polities'[80] or alternative social movements[81].

Conclusion

Future developments aside, it is clear that debates on the impact of recent reforms are, at this stage, highly speculative. The arguments which have been set out in this paper concern the nature of educational transmissions, rather than the extent to which they are absorbed, appropriated or resisted. Featherstone's criticisms of theories of mass culture are also applicable to education systems in that they share 'a strong view of the manipulability of mass audiences by a monolithic system and an assumption of the negative cultural effects of the media as self evident, with little empirical evidence about how goods and information are used in everyday practices'[82]. Even if it were possible to identify the needs of the new global marketplace, these would be mediated at the level of the school, which has its own grammar of accommodation and resistance. As Bernstein has argued, we need to look at the curriculum as more than just the carrier of external pressures. In common with other theories of cultural reproduction, many recent accounts 'appear to be more concerned with an analysis of what is reproduced in, and by, education than with an analysis of the medium of reproduction... It is as if the specialized discourse of education is only a voice through which others speak ... itself no more than a relay for power relations external to itself; a relay whose form has no consequence for what is relayed'.[83]

What has been clear thus far is that the policies and practices of schools within marketised systems display many contradictory elements and paradoxical tendencies. Bernstein himself claims that the market-oriented pedagogy is a 'much more complex construction' than what he terms the 'autonomous visible pedagogy'. It is, he argues, 'a new pedagogic Janus' which 'recontextualises and thus repositions within its own ideology features of apparently oppositional discourses'. There have, of course, always been contradictory elements within schooling - at system and classroom level,[84] but few have seemed as acute as those we are witnessing at the present time.

In this situation, we need to explore the relative impact of globalisation and the imperatives of the nation state and the relationship between the hidden curriculum of the market place and the overt lessons on the timetable. These are issues which could usefully be explored through a programme of empirical research. In addressing these questions it might be important to return to some of the understandings which were developed in the aftermath of the so-called 'new directions' for the sociology of education.[85]

The recent work of Bernstein[86] suggests ways in which such a task might be approached. He argues that the tensions that arise from the increasing deregulation of the economic field and the increasing regulation of what he terms the symbolic field are generating new forms of pedagogic identity. Education reforms are leading to the recontextualisation of elements of the 'retrospective' identity of old conservatism and the 'therapeutic identity' associated with the child centred progressivism of the 1960s and 1970s to produce two new hybrids, the 'decentred market' identity and the 'prospective' identity.

The 'decentred market' identity embodies the principles of neoliberalism. It has no intrinsic properties, its form is dependent only upon the exchange value determined by the market. It is therefore contingent upon local conditions and is highly unstable. The 'prospective' pedagogic

identity on the other hand attempts to 'recentre' through selectively incorporating elements of old conservatism. It engages with contemporary change, but draws on the stabilising tradition of the past as a counterbalance to the instability of the market. These two new pedagogic identities are therefore both complementary and contradictory. To some extent they can be seen to embody the tensions discussed within this paper. While the decentred market pedagogy can be seen to foster 'new' subjects, the 'prospective' pedagogy seeks to reconstruct 'old' subjects, albeit selectively in response to the pressures of a new economic and social climate.

The extent to which such pedagogic identities are being fostered by the new reforms requires further theoretical and empirical explorations. Such explorations require us to look at both form *and* content, the message *and* the medium, the juxtaposition of different types of knowledge and the complex and differential ways in which school knowledge relates to the everyday worlds of school students. The complexity and contradictions of recent developments may make such a task even more difficult than it appeared in the 1970s, but it needs to be addressed if we are to understand the ways in which subjects are being positioned by current policies and develop effective strategies for fostering alternative forms of social solidarity.

Bibliography

Abu Lughod, J (1991) 'Going Beyond Global Babble' in AD King (ed) *Culture, Globalization and the World-System*, London, Macmillan

Allen, J (1992) 'Post-Industrialism and post-Fordism', in S Hall, D Held and T McGrew (eds) *Modernity and its Futures*, Cambridge, Polity Press, pp 169-220

Angus, M (1995) 'Devolution of School Governance in an Australian State School System: Third Time Lucky?', in D S G Carter and M H O'Neill (eds) *Case Studies in Educational Change: An International Perspective*, London, Falmer Press

Apple, M W (1986) *Teachers and Texts: A Political Economy of Class and Gender Relations in Education*, New York, Routledge and Kegan Paul

Apple, M W (1996) *Cultural Politics and Education*, New York, Teachers College, Columbia University

Arnove, R (1996) 'Partnerships and Emancipatory Educational Movements: Issues and Prospects', *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, XLII (2) 170-77

Bailey, L (1995) 'The Correspondence Principle and the 1988 Education Reform Act', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 16 (4) 479-494

Ball, S J (1990) *Politics and Policy-Making in Education: Explorations in Policy Sociology*,

London, Routledge

Ball, S J (1994) *Education Reform: A Critical and Post-Structural Approach*, Buckingham, OU Press

Baudrillard, J (1988) *America*, London, Verso

Bernstein, B (1977) *Class, Codes and Control, Volume 3*, Second Edition, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul

Bernstein, B (1990) *The Structuring of Pedagogic Discourse: Class Codes and Control, Volume 4*, London, Routledge

Bernstein, B (1996) 'Educational Reforms and Pedagogic Identities', paper presented to the School of Education, University of Bristol, December

Blackmore, J (1995) 'Breaking out from a Masculinist Politics of Education' in B Limerick and B Lingard (eds) *Gender and Changing Education Management*, Rydalmere, NSW, Hodder Education

Bowles, S and Gintis, H (1976) *Schooling in Capitalist America*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul

Chubb, J and Moe, T (1990) *Politics, Markets and America's Schools*, Washington, Brookings Institution

Dale, R (1989) *The State and Education Policy*, Milton Keynes, Open University Press

Dale, R (1994) 'Constructing a New Education Settlement: Neo-Liberal and Neo-Schumpeterian Tendencies'. Paper presented to the NZARE Conference, University of Auckland, August

Delfattore, J (1992) *What Johnny Shouldn't Read*, New Haven, Yale University Press

Esland, G (1996) 'Knowledge and Nationhood: The New Right, Education and the Global Market', in J Avis, M Bloomer, G Esland, D Gleeson, and P Hodkinson *Knowledge and Nationhood: Education, Politics and Work*, London, Cassell

Featherstone, M (1995) *Undoing Culture: Globalization, Postmodernism and Identity*, London, Sage

Fiske, J, Hodge, B and Turner, G (eds) (1987) *Myths of Oz*, Sydney, Allen and Unwin

Gewirtz, S, Ball, S J and Bowe, R (1995) *Markets, Choice and Equity*, Milton Keynes, Open University Press

Giddens, A (1994) 'Living in a Post-Traditional Society', in U Beck, A Giddens and S Lash,

Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order, Cambridge, Polity Press, pp 56-109

Green, A (1996) 'Education, Globalization and the Nation State', paper presented at the symposium *'Education, Globalization and the Nation-State: Comparative Perspectives'* at the World Congress of Comparative Education Societies, University of Sydney, July 1-6, 1996

Hall, S (1991) 'The Local and the Global: Globalization and Ethnicity', in AD King (ed) *Culture, Globalization and the World-System*, London, Macmillan

Hargreaves, D H (1994) *The Mosaic of Learning: Schools and Teachers for the Next Century*, London, Demos

Harris, K (1996) 'The Corporate Invasion of Schooling: Some Implications for Pupils, Teachers and Education', *AARE SET: Research Information for Teachers*, 2

Harty, S (1994) 'Pied Piper Revisited', in D Bridges and TH McLaughlin (eds) *Education and the Market Place*, London, Falmer Press

Held, D (1989) 'The Decline of the Nation State', in S Hall and M Jacques (eds) *New Times: The Changing Face of Politics in the 1990s*, London, Lawrence and Wishart, pp 191-204

Henig, J R (1994) *Rethinking School Choice: Limits of the Market Metaphor*, Princeton, Princeton University Press

Hickox, M and Moore, R (1992) 'Education and post-Fordism a new correspondence', in P Brown and H Lauder (eds) *Education for Economic Survival: form Fordism to post-Fordism*, London, Routledge

Hillgate Group (1987) *The Reform of British Education*, London, Claridge Press

Hirst, P and Thompson, G (1996) *Globalization in Question: The International Government and the Possibilities of Governance*, Cambridge, Polity Press

Jameson, F (1991) *Postmodernism or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, London, Verso

Kenway, J (1992) 'Marketing education in the postmodern age', paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting, San Francisco, 20-4 April

Kenway, J with Bigum, C, Fitzclarence, L and Collier, J (1996 forthcoming) 'Pulp fictions? Education, markets and the information superhighway', in D Carlson & M Apple (eds) *Critical Educational Theory in Unsettling Times*, University of Minnesota Press

Lash, S and Urry, J (1987) *The End of Organized Capitalism*, Cambridge, Polity Press

McKenzie, J (1993) 'Education as a Private Problem or a Public Issue? The Process of Excluding "Education" from the "Public Sphere"'. Paper presented to the International Conference on the Public Sphere, Manchester, 8-10 January

Molnar, A (1996) *Giving Kids the Business: The Commercialization of America's Schools*, Boulder, Colorado, Westview/Harper Collins

Mumby, D and Stohl, C (1991) 'Power and Discourse in Organization Studies: Absence and the Dialiectic of Control', *Discourse and Society*, 28 (2) 313-32

Murray, R (1989) 'Fordism and post-Fordism', in S Hall and M Jacques (eds) *New Times: The Changing Face of Politics in the 1990s*, London, Lawrence and Wishart

National Consumer Council (1996) *Sponsorship in Schools*, London, National Consumer Council

Newmann, F (1993) 'Beyond Common Sense in Educational Restructuring: The Issues of Content and Leadership', *Educational Researcher*, 22(2), pp 4-13

Reich, R (1991) *The Work of Nations: Preparing Ourselves for 21st Century Capitalism*, London, Simon and Schuster

Roberts, P (1994) 'Business Sponsorship in Schools: A Changing Climate', in D Bridges and TH McLaughlin (eds) *Education and the Market Place*, London, Falmer Press

Robertson, R (1991) 'Social Theory, Cultural Relativity and the Problem of Globality', in AD King (ed) *Culture, Globalization and the World-System*, London, Macmillan

Robertson, S L (1993) 'The Politics of Devolution, Self-Management and Post-Fordism in Schools', in J Smyth (ed) *A Socially Critical View of the Self-Managing School*, London, Falmer Press

Slattery, L (1989) 'Goals set for nation's schools', *The Age*, April 15, 1

Usher, R and Edwards, R (1994) *Postmodernism and Education*, London, Routledge

Weiss, M (1993) 'New guiding principles in educational policy: the case of Germany', *Journal of Education Policy*. 8(4), pp 307-320

Whitty, G (1985) *Sociology and School Knowledge*, London, Methuen

Whitty, G, Edwards, T and Gewirtz, S (1993) *Specialisation and Choice in Urban Education: The City Technology College Experiment*, London, Routledge

Wiener, M J (1981) *English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit 1850-1980*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Willis, P (1977) *Learning to Labour*, Farnborough, Saxon House

Yeatman, A (1994) *Postmodern Revisionings of the Political*, New York, Routledge

Young, M F D (ed) (1971) *Knowledge and Control: New Directions for the Sociology of Education*, London, Collier-Macmillan

Endnotes

1. quoted in *Education*, 8 July 1988

2. A Green, 'Education, Globalization and the Nation State', paper presented at the symposium *'Education, Globalization and the Nation-State: Comparative Perspectives'* at the World Congress of Comparative Education Societies, University of Sydney, July 1-6, 1996

3. eg J Baudrillard, *America*, London,1988

4. A Giddens, 'Living in a Post-Traditional Society', in U Beck, A Giddens and S Lash, *Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order*, Cambridge, 1994, pp 56-109

5. R Murray, 'Fordism and post-Fordism', in S Hall and M Jacques (eds) *New Times: The Changing Face of Politics in the 1990s*, London, 1989, pp 38-54

6. J Allen, 'Post-Industrialism and post-Fordism', in S Hall, D Held and T McGrew (eds) *Modernity and its Futures*, Cambridge, 1992, pp 169-220

7. F Jameson, *Postmodernism or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, London, 1991

8. S Lash and J Urry, *The End of Organized Capitalism*, Cambridge, 1987

9. eg R Reich, *The Work of Nations: Preparing Ourselves for 21st Century Capitalism*, London, 1991

10. eg D Held, 'The Decline of the Nation State', in S Hall and M Jacques (eds) *New Times: The Changing Face of Politics in the 1990s*, London, 1989, pp 191-204

11. eg R Robertson, 'Social Theory, Cultural Relativity and the Problem of Globality', in AD King (ed) *Culture, Globalization and the World-System*, London, 1991

12. R Usher and R Edwards 1994, *Postmodernism and Education*, London, p175

13. R Dale, 'Constructing a New Education Settlement: Neo-Liberal and Neo-Schumpeterian Tendencies', paper presented to the NZARE Conference, University of Auckland, August, 1994

14. M Angus, 'Devolution of School Governance in an Australian State School System: Third Time Lucky?', in D S G Carter and M H O'Neill (eds) *Case Studies in Educational Change: An International Perspective*, London, 1995, p8

15. J Chubb and T Moe, *Politics, Markets and America's Schools*, Washington, 1991

16. F Newmann, 'Beyond Common Sense in Educational Restructuring: The Issues of Content and Leadership', *Educational Researcher*, 22(2) 1993, pp 4-13

17. A Molnar, *Giving Kids the Business: The Commercialization of America's Schools*, Boulder, Colorado. 1996

18. Green, op cit, p5

19. D Marquand 1995, quoted in G Esland, 'Knowledge and Nationhood: The New Right, Education and the Global Market', in J Avis, M Bloomer, G Esland, D Gleeson, and P Hodkinson *Knowledge and Nationhood: Education, Politics and Work*, London, 1996, p11

20. see M J Wiener, *English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit 1850-1980*, Cambridge. 1981

21. Molnar op cit

22. P Roberts, 'Business Sponsorship in Schools: A Changing Climate', in D Bridges and TH McLaughlin (eds) *Education and the Market Place*, London, 1994

23. K Harris 'The Corporate Invasion of Schooling: Some Implications for Pupils, Teachers and Education', *AARE SET: Research Information for Teachers*, 2, 1996

24. National Consumer Council, *Sponsorship in Schools*, London, 1996

25. Molnar op cit

26. S Harty, 'Pied Piper Revisited', in D Bridges and TH McLaughlin (eds) *Education and the Market Place*, London,, 1994, p97

27. ibid pp98-9

28. Molnar op cit

29. G Whitty, T Edwards and S Gewirtz, *Specialisation and Choice in Urban Education: The City Technology College Experiment*, London, 1993

30. Usher and Edwards, op cit, p175

31. J McKenzie, 'Education as a Private Problem or a Public Issue? The Process of Excluding "Education" from the "Public Sphere"'. Paper presented to the International Conference on the Public Sphere, Manchester, 8-10 January 1993

32. Hillgate Group, *The Reform of British Education*, London, 1987

33. eg L Slattery, 'Goals set for nation's schools', *The Age*, 1989, April 15, 1

34. see, for instance, J Fiske, B Hodge and G Turner, G (eds) *Myths of Oz*, Sydney, 1987

35. J Delfattore, *What Johnny Shouldn't Read*, New Haven, 1992

36. M. Apple, *Cultural Politics and Education*, New York, 1996

37. Hall op cit, p25

38. Marquand, op cit

39. S J Ball, *Education Reform: A Critical and Post-Structural Approach*, Buckingham, 1994, p146

40. Molnar op cit

41. J Kenway, 'Marketing education in the postmodern age', paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting, San Francisco, 20-4 April 1992, p14

42. *Tennessee Education Association News*, cited in Molnar op cit, p159

43. Whitty et al, op cit

44. S Gewirtz, S J Ball and R Bowe, *Markets, Choice and Equity*, Milton Keynes, 1995

45. Usher and Edwards op cit

46. J Kenway with C Bigum, L Fitzclarence, and J Collier,'Pulp fictions? Education, markets and the information superhighway', in D Carlson & M Apple (eds) *Critical Educational Theory in Unsettling Times*, Minnesota, 1996 forthcoming

47. D Mumby and C Stohl, 'Power and Discourse in Organization Studies: Absence and the Dialectic of Control', *Discourse and Society*, 28 (2), 1991, pp313-32

48. Usher and Edwards op cit, p174

49. J Blackmore, 'Breaking out from a Masculinist Politics of Education' in B Limerick and B Lingard (eds) *Gender and Changing Education Management*, Rydalmere, NSW, 1995, p45

50. Halpin et al, 1996 forthcoming

51. Gewirtz et al op cit

52. Whitty et al op cit

53. Kenway et al op cit

54. M W Apple, *Teachers and Texts: A Political Economy of Class and Gender Relations in Education*, New York, 1986

55. reported in S L Robertson, 'The Politics of Devolution, Self-Management and Post-Fordism in Schools', in J Smyth (ed) *A Socially Critical View of the Self-Managing School*, London, 1993, p129

56. ibid 129-30

57. Lash and Urry op cit

58. S Bowles and H Gintis, *Schooling in Capitalist America*, London, 1976, p131

59. see R Dale, *The State and Education Policy*, Milton Keynes, 1989 and M Weiss, 'New guiding principles in educational policy: the case of Germany', *Journal of Education Policy* 8(4), 1993, pp 307-320

60. P Hirst and G Thompson, *Globalization in Question: The International Government and the Possibilities of Governance*, Cambridge, 1996

61. Allen op cit

62. J Abu Lughod, 'Going Beyond Global Babble' in AD King (ed) *Culture, Globalization and the World-System*, London, 1991

63. J Tooley 1995

64. L Bailey, 'The Correspondence Principle and the 1988 Education Reform Act', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 16 (4), 1995, pp479-494, p482

65. M Hickox and R Moore, 'Education and post-Fordism a new correspondence', in P Brown and H Lauder (eds) *Education for Economic Survival: form Fordism to post-Fordism*, London, 1992

66. B Bernstein, *The Structuring of Pedagogic Discourse: Class Codes and Control, Volume 4*, London, 1990, p??

67. Bernstein 1977, *Class, Codes and Control, Volume 3*, Second Edition, London, pp187-88

68. P Willis, *Learning to Labour*, Farnborough, 1977

69. S Hall, 'The Local and the Global: Globalization and Ethnicity', in AD King (ed) *Culture, Globalization and the World-System*, London, 1991, p44

70. ibid, p45

71. M Featherstone, *Undoing Culture: Globalization, Postmodernism and Identity*, London, 1995, pp110

72. J R Henig, *Rethinking School Choice: Limits of the Market Metaphor*, Princeton, 1994, p222

73. Featherstone, op cit

74. S J Ball, *Politics and Policy-Making in Education: Explorations in Policy Sociology*, London, 1990

75. D H Hargreaves, *The Mosaic of Learning: Schools and Teachers for the Next Century*, London, 1994

76. Green op cit, p59

77. ibid, p59

78. R Dale op cit 1994

79. Green op cit, p59

80. Yeatman, *Postmodern Revisionings of the Political*, New York, 1994

81. R Arnove, 'Partnerships and Emancipatory Educational Movements: Issues and Prospects', *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, XLII (2), 1996, pp170-77

82. Featherstone op cit, p115

83. Bernstein op cit 1990, p166

84. Dale op cit 1989

85. M F D Young (ed)*Knowledge and Control: New Directions for the Sociology of Education*, London, 1971

86. B Bernstein, 'Educational Reforms and Pedagogic Identities', paper presented to the School of Education, University of Bristol, December 1996